

Applicati n N . Applicant(s) 09/515,675 KASHIMA, KEIJI Interview Summary

interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tarifur R Chowdhury	2871
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) Tarifur R Chowdhury.	(3)	
(2) Mr. Eric Morehouse.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 13 August 2002.		
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☑ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.	
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1 and 6</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>none</u> .		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached	l. g)⊠ was not reached. h)[□ N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative provided the examiner with a proposed amendment to obviate the rejection mailed on 05/29/02. Applicant's representative was notified that further consideration and/or search would be required to define patentibility. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims		
allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attach		vould render the claims
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a checked).	separate record of the substance	ce of the interview(if box is
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FO MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIE action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ON STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIE reverse side or on attached sheet.	W. (See MPEP Section 713.04 IE MONTH FROM THIS INTER). If a reply to the last Office VIEW DATE TO FILE A

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required